HISTORICAL REPRINT SERIES

ANALYSIS OF MARXISM



BY

WILLIAM JOYCE

ANALYSIS OF MARXISM
By William Joyce
Director of Propaganda, British Union of Fascists

"To speak his thoughts is every freeman's right.
In peace and war, in council and in fight."
Homer Illiad Bk. xii. 1.249
Trans. Alexanda Pope.1688-1744

First Edition *Fascist Quarterly*. October 1936. London

Second Edition *Helmsman Publications.* 1979. London

Third Edition *Renaissance Press.* 2000. P.O. Box 1627,
Paraparaumu Beach. New Zealand.

Fourth Edition *Steven Books. 2003.* Canterbury, Kent. England

This reprint by Steven Books 2014. Essex, England.

Origination initial reproduction by *Europa Front*
Canterbury , Kent, Englnd.

SB

ISBN 9781907861437

Please address all correspondence and payments to:

LEAGUE ENTERPRISES
Kemp House
152-160 City Road
London. EC1V 2NX
England.

Also on the internet - www.stevenbooks.co.uk

ANALYSIS OF MARXISM

BY WILLIAM JOYCE

NO time could be more suitable than the present for an examination, exposure and annihilation of Marxist theory. There is now little tendency to dispute the fact that the great issue confronting the modern world is the struggle between Fascism and Communism; or as some may prefer to describe it, the conflict between National Socialism and International Socialism.

In defining the limits of this contest we must, even though parenthetically, observe that Bolshevism or International Socialism enjoys the support of international finance which in its general character is Jewish. The international dictators regard the principle of internationalism as incomparably more important than any theory concerning the distribution of wealth; for they are well aware that Internationalist movements can make no progress whatever without the capital which they are in a position to supply, and they have learned through an experience which is long, though possibly not fallacious that wherever they assist they lay down conditions and control developments.

This apparent digression is made only because the reader would gain a very false conception of the world situation if he were to assume that Communism, Bolshevism or Socialism were workers' movements. Workers, it is true, belong to the movement in each case; but the movement belongs to the international plutocrats who provide it with the sinews of war.

The next consideration to be borne in mind is that Marxism, and Marxism alone, represents the effective element in Socialist propaganda. The ordinary Socialist Member of Parliament may be, and in fact, is quite unable to inform his constituents whether or not he approves of general nationalization; much less can he explain whether, in the event of nationalization, compensation should or should not be given. Least of all can he defend his position if he approves of compensation, and thereby restores with the left hand the private property which he expropriates with the right. Some lofty Laski, enshrined in the comfort which only the workers know how to provide, may declare that Marxist theory has not stood the test of time; he is either unheard by the masses or else honoured for daring to display an independence of outlook which costs nothing. The fact is that if Socialism in any of its two-hundred and fifty-four definitions means anything to the masses of the people, it must mean the elimination of private property with any degree of expropriation that may be necessary to that end. This is a doctrine which may be thought anti-social or criminal, but which is, at the least, definite and intelligible. No other statement

of Socialist policy yields up to analysis any meaning whatever, except, perhaps, the desire of a certain class to find some compromise between Communism in theory and Liberal capitalism in practice, in order that the worker may have the opportunity of voting for those who think that he is entitled to the fullness of the earth but see no means of procuring it for him. Thus it would be futile to waste any time in discussing what are called Socialist policies. They demonstrate the pathological absurdity of Marx and International Socialism doomed to collapses, leaving National Socialism as its only alternative.

Marxism is the creed which identifies man with beast, and is, therefore, completely incompatible with Nationalism. To identify man with beast is to eliminate all such sentiments, feelings and experiences as national honour, national tradition, national solidarity and love of the soil. The argument is simple. If a French worm does not differ perceptibly from an English worm, how can a French worker differ perceptibly from an English worker? This simple and innocent question is the great pillar of the Internationalist edifice. Beasts experience the need for very little private property; hence, says the Marxist, the institution is one which cannot be necessary to man: the domestic and useful animals being in the position, but without the advantages of the wage-slave.

Such a political outlook is exactly what ought to be expected from a Jew. Marx was a Jew. True to the type of his race, he regarded the Gentiles as beasts and, of course, saw in Nationalism a force opposed to the annexations, encroachments and acquisitions which the Jewish race makes at the expense of the races into contact with which it comes. Nationalism means, after all, that the wealth of a land is reserved for those to whom it belongs. This principle, however, if translated into fact, would immobilize the Jew and put an end to his peripatetic depredations. Marxism is then identical with Internationalism, which means collective insecurity of property for all but the international dictators.

Leaving for a time the field of international relations, let us examine exactly what is essential to Marxist theory as applied to any one people. The system of Marx rests chiefly upon one proposition expressed in his own axiom: *"From each according to his means; to each according to his needs,"* The most superficial mathematical examination of this proposition shows that, in the Marxian State, there is to be no correlation between merit and reward. A bibulous, amorphous agglomeration of fat, weighing 18 stone, can well claim to need more than a brilliant, industrious and useful doctor or engineer of one-half his weight. Applying the Marxian principle, however, we should find it necessary to exact from the sparse and slightly built citizen all that his means could render, in order that the adipose of Marxist theory might be sustained in his adiposity. No other meaning can possibly be attached to the dictum under discussion, which is nevertheless, accepted greedily by every unfortunate

creature who is confident that he will remain a sub-man for the whole of his days. To a sub-man's needs no arbitrary limit need be set: as to his means, he can but give what he possesses and would, therefore, be indemnified against loss. Marx tries to assist this grotesque thesis by a very elaborate rationalization known as the *"Labour Theory of Value"*. According to this theory all wealth is created by labour and, therefore, labour is entitled to a whole of whatever reward may be available. An argument of this kind, though capable of capturing many, could scarcely be formulated by any but the Jewish cheat. The Communist propagandist hopes, in the first place, that those whom he describes as the Proletariat will identify labour with themselves. The more polished and illustrious exponents of the theory say that, of course, allowances must be made for the labour performed by professional men; but to judge by the lot of professional workers in Russia, the Communist propagandist has good reason to suggest that "Labour" and the "Proletariat" are identical terms. When pressed in respect of this argument, the Socialist will agree that the doctor, the lawyer, the engineer and the artist do indeed perform work, and, according to his own social position, he will decide whether or not they are excessively remunerated. It is useless to remind him that in all countries, however savage, land, labour and capital exist, but that only the intangible quality of organizing ability is capable of differentiating civilisation from barbarism. He will possibly observe that even organizing ability is a form of work deserving of reward. But here we reach the question crucial to the whole Marxian system; by what means it is possible to compare or equate the utterly incommensurable phenomena of energy-expending labour, be it physical or mental and, creative intellect?

It is a scientific fact beyond any contradiction or refutation that creative intellect is different not in degree. but actually in kind, from any form of effort. The third-year mathematical student, steadily plodding, his head wrapped in towels, does far more *work* in any mechanical sense of the word, or, in fact, in any sense of the word, than the mathematical genius who, without effort, conceives some new law, the application of which is capable of revolutionizing society. It was certainly not as a result of labour that Newton deduced the law of gravitation; and, as I have said elsewhere, genius is not an infinite capacity for taking pains; it is a capacity for achieving results without taking pains; some of the most brilliant manifestations of intellect have been spontaneous and effortless.

As then there exists no standard of measurement common to work and the higher mental processes, the comprehension of these two utterly different phenomena in the same category is a fallacy automatically destructive of any theory which may depend upon it. This heinous error which is the essence of Marxism arises quite naturally from its author's materialism. Creative intellect as a special factor of the human organism cannot be admitted by anyone who

regards man as a purely material organism whose whole behaviour must be explicable in terms of physics or chemistry, Marx was the most thorough materialist of all time for he has induced hundreds of thousands to believe that man is a sort of vegetative entity altogether conditioned and utterly dominated by its mineral environment.

The whole character of Marxism is revealed and firmly portrayed in its refusal to recognize in man any element but the grossly material, and herein incidentally lies the supreme and fundamental opposition between Communism and National Socialism. The Communist must believe that man is entirely controlled and conditioned by his environment, whereas the National Socialist knows that man, by reason of his superiority over the animal world, does overcome mould and make the environment which Providence places at his disposal.. Indeed, the most striking discovery made in the realm of modern psychology, through the work of Lankes is that man by act of will can even control the rate of his own bodily metabolism. This fact Is attested by indisputable laboratory proof, it affords a fine instance of National Socialism's great law; namely, that man, far from being the slave of circumstances, is designed and constructed to create the circumstances most suited to his well being.

Now, however, it is necessary to descend from philosophical speculation to that gross level at which argument on Marxism becomes possible. The third proposition upon which the verminous old Hebrew's system rests is expressed in the language of the popular agitator, that in any given period, however short, the "workers" must consume the sum total of the wealth produced through the agency of their labour. It may be objected that I am modifying or even distorting the Marxist thesis, but to this accusation I would reply that we have to consider Marxism as it is expounded by the faithful to the incredulous and credulous alike. Frequently the Communist orator assures his audience that no system is just unless the workers immediately consume £100 worth of wealth for every £100 worth of wealth that they have produced. If this edict is to be interpreted literally, we shall be privileged to see the workers at great railway centres sitting down to consume their locomotives and rolling stock before sunset in order to demonstrate the solidarity of the proletariat. Not all Marx's ingenious temptations and demented ravings have been able to persuade Soviet Russia that capital is unnecessary; otherwise she would scarce have borrowed money from every capitalist sufficiently perverted to lend it; neither would she have raised internal loans at rates of interest which seem extravagantly liberal in capitalist countries. One clear truth is that all production must come to an end unless some portion of created wealth is reserved as a basis for the creation of further wealth. We need not examine the scope of the term "worker" in this proposition. If anybody were to consume the sum total of produced wealth at any time, the means of production would also be consumed and human society would cease to exist.

Hence we are entitled to denounce as absurd and mendacious in the highest degree this Marxist theory the iniquity of which cannot be palliated by any such obscurantist phraseology as *"surplus value"*. That the present system is vicious we have never doubted; there is Indeed no answer to the charge that it exists for the exploitation of the many by the few. Likewise it is perfectly true that at present vast quantity of private property are owned by the few whilst the over whelming majority lack a sufficiency of private property to satisfy their needs of life, much less to provide its amenities. The cardinal economic fallacy then, in the Communist doctrine is that private property must be destroyed in order to make the human race happy. The National Socialist reply is, quite naturally, that the amount of private property must be so increased as to provide all worthy citizens with every reasonable requirement in the way of necessity and luxury, whilst at the same time the distribution of wealth must be based upon the criterion of service as opposed to voracity.

The National Socialist case does not rest upon the assumption that private property is synonymous with the acquisition of wealth by some at the expense of others: this assumption is utterly untrue. It is possible so to regulate wages, prices, rents, dividends and all other economic elements, that there shall be adequate private property for all, granted only that there must first be removed the brake upon production which is constituted at present by the international power of financial democracy. If production be increased, as it can be increased to the necessary extent, if money be made the servant of of industry, and if credit and capital be used for the nation as opposed to the speculative ventures of international finance, the total quantity of wealth in existence, together with the presence of the purchasing power necessary for distribution, will ensure the allocation of private property to all, but through an ordered system in proportions relative to the services rendered to society by the recipient.

In mathematical notation, the facts are simply expressed.

Let T = total production.

Let x = portion of production paid in wages and salaries to the workers.

Let y = portion of production devoted to capital-accumulation and profit.

Then,

$$x \quad + \quad y \quad = \quad T \qquad (60) \qquad (40) \qquad (100)$$

If T, at present, equals 100, x may perhaps be represented by 60, while the figure of 100 is assumed to represent the workers' needs. The Marxist objects that the workers *"needs are not being met, and cannot be met, because there is withheld from them the 40 which is surplus value "*, in the form of *"rent, interest and profit"*.

If, however, production be doubled, there holds good the same equation :—

$$x \quad + \quad y \quad = \quad T \qquad (120) \qquad (80) \qquad (200)$$

and there is now no reason why x should be less than 120. Indeed, the Law of Increasing Returns under mass-production conditions will tend to give x an

even higher value than 120. The *"workers' needs"* are thus more than satisfied without the elimination of private property; or, as a friend of mine remarked, *"You can produce enough to cram everybody's belly and still leave a surplus."*

A calm and impartial survey of these facts must dispose for ever of the lunatic theory of surplus values. No Jewish charlatan, no economic quack was needed to tell the world that while the amount of production was limited, some must benefit at the expense of others. Any child in the nursery could have seen as much; but it is equally clear that if production be extended to meet the needs of society, there is no mathematical reason whatever why the enrichment of some lead should to the impoverishment of others, provided always that we forbid with draconian severity the form of exploitation or piracy which prevails under such euphemisms as Free Trade, Free Competition and Free Investment

Having thus examined the three basic conditions of Marxist economics, we may well be aghast at the thought that such patent fallacies should ever have exerted any hold over the human mind. Allowance must be made in the first instance for the fact that the majority of human beings believe what they wish to believe; that conviction is determined much less by reason than by emotional and conative tendencies of which the individual maybe be but dimly aware. On the other hand, historically considered the development of Marxism is exactly the answer which might have been expected to the dogma of the Manchester School. It is, in fact, a rotten answer to a rotten question. The Marxist talks in exactly the same terms as the tenth-rate philosophical hack apologist of the starvation school of economics. The propagandist of the Manchester School asks: *"Is it not right that wages should be as low as possible in order that profits be great and industry may thrive?"* The Communist answers: *"No, not only wages but every tiling else belongs to the workers, and we have no time for capitalism or private enterprise"*. The Mancunian pedagogue asks: *"is it not right to buy labour in the cheapest market and sell its product in the dearest?* The Communist answers: *"We are wage slaves and we are being exploited in the interests of profit"*

Neither pedagogue or pupil has ever caught even the most fleeting glimpse of reality; for the whole premises of the lesson are thoroughly vicious and horribly remote from the salient truth that wealth lies, not in money but in the spirit and resources of a nation. Side by side, step by step, cheek by jowl International Democracy and Marxian Communism have walked together as inseparable and inalienable comrades. The liaison, of course, has become closer since the Financial Democrat has found it desirable to help the Communist sub-man in his attacks upon National Socialism.

Thus for nearly a century mankind has been fighting and quarrelling over the distribution of the strictly limited, when science has placed the unlimited within its grasp. It follows that the radical and ferocious opposition exists, not between Communism and Capitalism, but between both and Fascism, which represents a transvaluation of all values and, by destroying the piracy inherent in Liberalism, likewise and at the same time cuts away the roots of Communism. Capitalism as at present interpreted is a stimulus which must inevitably provoke the reaction of Communism: remove the stimulus and the reaction vanishes. Destroy Trade, Free Competition, Free Investment and free exploitation: scientifically increase production and distribution, and Communism must of necessity vanish, though it may be sustained for some time by pathological organisms of a sub-human type, and it will certainly be sustained so long as Financial Democracy is strong enough to employ the lowest type of articulating beast against the National-Socialist man.

Without wishing to digress too far, we might finally glance at one of Marx's greatest hoaxes, *"The materialistic conception of history "*. According to this fabrication of dialectic impertinence, all human motives are economic. It Is doubtful if even a psychological student inebriated and debauched with the worst excesses of Freud could accept such a theory without doing violence to what he would describe as his "scientific outlook". To give wealth, to give health, to give life itself for the sake of an ideal is not to act in accord with economic motives; but the numbers of those who have made all these sacrifices amount to countless millions. True it is that the lousy old Jew, fed by a Jewish capitalist whilst he was writing in comfort in the British Museum, could scarcely imagine himself sacrificing anything, nor could he suppose that anybody else would act without an economic motive.

It is in this respect that the Jew has so consistently failed to understand the Aryan. In history economic motives count for very little, just as economic resources count for relatively little. Frederick the Great, almost unaided, was able to overcome Austria, Russia and France. A little handful of gunmen in Ireland, so insignificant that they would be lost in Hyde Park, extorted surrender from the mighty British Government in 1922 merely because they possessed a superior degree of determination. In discounting the materialistic conception of history, it is unnecessary to invoke martyrs and saints, who deserve a category of their own, and who can scarcely be regarded as typical of mankind in degree ; but of the millions of our people who fought in the last war, how many thousands believed that they were serving any economic motive? Marx, of course, here gives an excellent illustration of his total incapacity to understand the Western mind, just as in expressing the Labour Theory of Value he fails to see that by polishing a pebble assiduously for three weeks, the worker is not necessarily contributing value to it however much labour he expends.

The greatest achievements in history have not been the results of mechanically evolving processes of economic determinism. Those of us who are familiar with Irish politics, for example, realize that in Ireland economics have no meaning at all, and that an embargo against Irish goods, however necessary in fact, or how ever salutary from the English point of view, does not serve to produce the least change in the disposition either of the Irish people or their politicians.

It is, however, unnecessary to develop this theme any further. No white man worthy of the name would even suppose, even if he had not studied psychology, that his motives were economically determined. If any such belief gained real currency, marriage as an institution would rapidly come to an end; for how rarely in these days is the motive of marriage economic! Of course, it *was* brought to an end in Soviet Russia, and frantic attempts are now being made to restore it, because into the dim sensorium of the Bolshevik mind there is at last penetrating, though very slowly, the significant truth that parents and children are causally related. So advanced a theory of life could scarcely have occurred to Marx. It still remains a part of Marxist propaganda to ridicule, destroy and exterminate the family, just as it is also deemed necessary to eliminate the worship of God. The affection which should prevail in the family, and the worship of the Divine, are non-economic motives, and for this reason, because they do not accord with Marx, they are to be abolished,

So the Marxist sets out to destroy every specifically human value; so he conspires to deny or obscure the existence of any factor whereby man may triumph over material obstacles. Thus, of all doctrines that of Marx is the most slavish, that alone condemns man to be a slave for all time, and who shall say that this odious and pernicious theory of servitude was not propagated for absorption by Gentiles alone? Certainly the Jews who adopt Communist practice wink at its theories and make sure that they secure control of whatever organization they join. If this assumption seems far-fetched, or if I seem to have handled with bias the subject of Marxian materialism, I can only refer the reader to the gigantic and sustained attempt which has been made in Russia to establish atheism and destroy religion. No man who believes In a God is fit to enter the slave state of Bolshevism. No man who believes in the family is fit to remain in it.

It is sad to think that when man has been struggling for so many centuries to liberate himself from the shackles of material circumstances, when he has waged an incessant war with nature that he may triumph over sordid obstacles, when he has thought, worked, spoken and written to show his mastery over the dumb and inanimate, there should even now be in progress a crusade against every higher value that he has dared to conceive. Such is the crusade of Marx. The Communist is not merely a luckless creature who strives to make respectable his inferiority by denying superiority to all others; such is the mere preroga-

every higher value that he has dared to conceive. Such is the crusade of Marx. The Communist is not merely a luckless creature who strives to make respectable his inferiority by denying superiority to all others; such is the mere prerogative of the bourgeois Democrat. The Communist, rather, feels that the lowest type of creature has no power to transcend the limitations of environment, and therefore he demands that this power should be denied to all others, lest some, but particularly he himself, should be at a disadvantage. Here, in Communism is the whole ardent plea of the sub - man for the universality of sub - humanity.

This article, however, was intended to deal with Marx alone, and the subject upon examination possesses so little substance that it would be an injustice to the reader to protract the discussion. It was inevitable, of course, that the Marxian creed should divide humanity into two camps. In the one would be the worshippers of materialism and the haters of higher human values. In the other camp would stand those Aryan men and women who believe in the unconquerable greatness of the human spirit, and the subordination to it of all economic and material considerations. Wars are won not by material resources, but by the will to win, and though the conflict today is severe it can have one result only, for the triumph of the will can be accorded only to those who espouse the doctrine of the will.

Whatever the victory may have cost, man has so far asserted his dominion over Nature; whatever sacrifices have been made, man has shown that he can transcend the stubborn boundaries of the inanimate. This power to transcend is Life itself; and if life is to remain on this planet, it will survive as the dynamic power of National Socialism, killing and annihilating the Marxian virus of Death.



William Joyce

Born in New York, USA of Irish parents. He was executed after the Second World War for speaking on the German radio.

He is seen here during the time when he was a member of the British Union of Fascists.